## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA ALEXANDRIA DIVISION

Civil Action No. 18cv697 MATTHEW McDONALD, et al., .

Plaintiffs,

Alexandria, Virginia vs.

September 7, 2018

10:44 a.m. EDWARD G. ROBINSON, et al., .

Defendants.

TRANSCRIPT OF MOTIONS HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE LEONIE M. BRINKEMA UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

## APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS: CATHY A. HINGER, ESQ.

Womble Bond Dickinson (US) LLP

1200 - 19th Street, N.W.

Suite 500

Washington, D.C. 20036

FOR EDWARD G. ROBINSON AND Richard C. Baker, ESQ. EDWARD G. ROBINSON III Baker Simmons

CONSULTING, LLC: 2120 L Street, N.W., Suite 305

Washington, D.C. 20037

FOR CARLA DeSILVA McPHUN LAURA GOLDEN LIFF, ESQ.

AND CADEM CAPITAL GROUP: MICHAEL B. BROWN, ESQ.

Miles & Stockbridge, PC

1751 Pinnacle Drive, Suite 1500

Tysons Corner, VA 22102

ALSO PRESENT: DENNIS McDONALD

MATTHEW McDONALD

(Pages 1 - 11)

COMPUTERIZED TRANSCRIPTION OF STENOGRAPHIC NOTES

		2
1	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER:	ANNELIESE J. THOMSON, RDR, CRR U.S. District Court, Third Floor 401 Courthouse Square
3		Alexandria, VA 22314 (703)299-8595
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

```
4
 1
    responded.
 2
               MS. HINGER: Correct, Your Honor.
 3
               THE COURT: And there's no secret, you understand
 4
     that there's a guilty plea scheduled for this individual on my
 5
     docket.
               MS. HINGER: For D'Andrade?
 6
 7
               THE COURT: I believe so, yes.
 8
               MS. HINGER: I just learned that this week, either
     the 17th or the 19th of this month.
 9
10
               THE COURT: Right. And there's also a guilty plea
11
     scheduled for McPhun. That's coming down the pike. Are you
12
    representing her for that, too?
13
               MS. LIFF: No, Your Honor.
14
               THE COURT: All right. And, Mr. Baker, there's a
15
     different -- is there another Robinson involved in this case?
16
               MR. BAKER: No, Your Honor.
17
               THE COURT: No, all right. Your client is not facing
18
     criminal charges, or is he?
19
               MR. BAKER: That is correct. He is not.
20
               THE COURT: All right, okay.
21
               Well, as you know -- and the United States, is there
22
     anyone here from the United States?
23
                              (No response.)
24
               THE COURT: We allowed them to intervene. You're all
25
     aware of that, correct? So that's going to be a problem in
```

terms of the discovery at this point, but we'll face that down the road.

So we have these three motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction or failure to state a claim, but, you know, this is a RICO case, a civil RICO case, and with civil RICO cases, there's a much broader approach to personal jurisdiction. I really don't think there's any merit to any of these three motions, and I think the response of the plaintiffs has adequately shown that at least at this point, this case involves wire fraud, it involves mail fraud, and it involves all types of fraud. I'm not at all convinced that the RICO count would not be successful down the road.

I'll hear any argument any of you want to make, but, I mean, at this point, certainly the victims have had enough connection to the commonwealth. The one entity is in Virginia. There are banking and other transactions that occur in Virginia. That's enough of a hook in a RICO case to allow for personal jurisdiction.

So I don't think there's any issue that this case is appropriately in this district and that the defendants have been -- I'm sorry, that the complaint adequately pleads the necessary elements of the offense, but I'll hear any brief response counsel want to make to that.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, we would make a couple of points with respect to the 12(b)(6) argument. First of all,

that is that the PSLRA's RICO amendment would bar any action that would be actionable as securities fraud.

THE COURT: Yeah, but I'm not at all convinced that these are securities. I mean -- and I think that's something down the road, if there is discovery in this case, you might be able to come back and make that argument to me, but as you know, there were various things that the defendants are alleged to have been selling to the plaintiffs. There were real estate, pieces of property. Then there were just outright loans, as I understand it.

So there are different types of what I'll call commodities or things that were being exchanged, and I'm not sure they would all necessarily as a matter of law qualify as securities.

MR. BROWN: I appreciate the Court's view on that. I would look to the verified complaint and the allegations there, and that's a basis for our motion. And in the verified complaint, the plaintiffs say repeatedly that each of the transactions, quote, was an investment contract because plaintiffs expected their profits to come solely from the efforts of others, the definition of a security, and they also in the verified complaint stated that each of the transactions was a security, and that's at six different places.

Based on that, taking the allegations as true at this stage, we submit -- and recognizing also that the plaintiffs

- have pleaded both state and federal securities violations, we submit that there is an inconsistency there.

  And we also would suggest that this is properly
- resolved at the motion to dismiss stage. The three principal cases on which we rely -- the MLSMK case out of the Second

  Circuit, the Bald Eagle case out of the Third Circuit, and the

  Capital Investment Funding case out of South Carolina -- all

  were resolved at the motion to dismiss stage.
- 9 So in light of that, we do think it's appropriately
  10 dealt with at this stage.
- 11 THE COURT: All right. I'm still going to deny the
  12 motion, without prejudice to it being renewed when we see a
  13 fuller record, all right?
- MR. BROWN: Would the Court entertain argument as to the second argument, which is the pattern of racketeering activity?
- THE COURT: No. I think it's clearly pled, all right? But thank you.
- MR. BROWN: I understand.
- THE COURT: So -- and I don't know what's going to
  happen. Have you talked, any of you, with the U.S. Attorney's
  Office as to how they're going to get involved in the discovery
  in this case?
- MS. HINGER: Yes, Your Honor.
- 25 THE COURT: All right. Why don't you tell me what

1 your understanding is just so I can see what's coming down the
2 pike, all right?

MS. HINGER: Thank you, Your Honor. My understanding, I learned from Grace Hill on Wednesday that they would be filing the motion to intervene. I have concerns because we were on a tight schedule. We were before Judge Buchanan last month and entered our discovery schedule, so we're launching discovery. We've served some discovery. I've got more going out today to keep with that schedule.

My concern is that Mr. McDonald and McDHoldings are not going to be included, is my understanding, as victims in the plea that's being entered by the defendants in this case, and Keisha Williams is not a defendant in this case, so that makes us a little bit unlike any of the cases that she's relying on for her intervention.

I did see that you referred her motion to stay to Judge Buchanan, and my hope is that what we can do is reach a stipulated agreement that any testimonial discovery from Ms. McPhun or Mr. D'Andrade can be put off until after the criminal trial. I think as a practical matter, that's what's going to happen anyway, because I'm in document collection mode right now, but the predominant part of my discovery is going to be seeking records from banks and third parties to trace what happened to my clients' money when they took it, and that's uniquely known to Mr. Robinson, the banks that are involved and

```
1
     this other third-party AmeriFunding, so there's a lot of
 2
     discovery that I can conduct that will not impact, I don't
 3
     think, in any way the Keisha Williams trial.
 4
               So my hope is we can negotiate a resolution --
 5
               THE COURT: All right.
               MS. HINGER: -- that works for everyone and so we
 6
 7
     won't have to have a hearing on the 21st in front of Judge
 8
     Buchanan, or I can present an agreed stipulation, but Ms. Hill
 9
     felt strongly on Wednesday that she had to file her motion, and
10
     we really didn't have time to get through that.
11
               She hadn't seen my discovery yet, so I said: Let me
12
    get it out, and I did share with her the discovery.
13
               THE COURT: All right. But it's your understanding
14
     that the McDonalds at this point are not included among the
15
     potential victims in this case?
16
               MS. HINGER: I think that the U.S. Attorney's Office
17
     believes that they were part of the scheme, but they have not
18
     been included as victims in the, the conduct that is being
19
     indicted, nor are they going to be identified as victims in the
20
     pleas, as I understand it.
21
               THE COURT: I'm sorry, when you say "part of the
22
     scheme, you mean as offenders or as victims?
23
               MS. HINGER: As victims.
24
               THE COURT: Oh, all right. Yeah.
25
               MS. HINGER: I think the case got indicted with a
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
number of victims, and maybe not all of the victims -- offenses
against all of the victims were included because it's so many
and they don't need that many. I don't know why they're not
including my clients in it, but the fact that they intervened
in this and the fact that I got the call from Ms. Hill
reflects to me that they do understand that they were part of
the same -- victims in the same scheme.
          THE COURT: But you do understand that -- my
understanding is that in any fraud case, anyone who can show
that they've been the victim of the fraud has a right to apply
as a victim in terms of the restitution mechanism that the U.S.
Attorney's Office has.
          MS. HINGER: I expect that we will be doing that,
yes.
          THE COURT: Okay.
          MS. HINGER: We just learned about this on Wednesday.
          THE COURT: All right.
          MS. HINGER: We've just started discussing it with
them. So that will be unfolding.
          THE COURT: All right. Well, we'll have to see how
it all plays out, but again, civil litigation is expensive, and
to the extent that some issues really may not be defensible, it
may make sense to try to work out things as quickly as you can,
all right?
          MS. HINGER: Certainly, Your Honor.
```